

From glowbugs@theporch.com Sat Jul 20 11:43:10 1996
Return-Path: glowbugs@theporch.com
Received: from uro (localhost.theporch.com [127.0.0.1]) by uro.theporch.com
(8.7.5/AUX-3.1.1) with SMTP id LAA10441; Sat, 20 Jul 1996 11:41:03 -0500 (CDT)
Date: Sat, 20 Jul 1996 11:41:03 -0500 (CDT)
Message-Id: <199607201641.LAA10441@uro.theporch.com>
Errors-To: ws4s@midtenn.net
Reply-To: glowbugs@theporch.com
Originator: glowbugs@theporch.com
Sender: glowbugs@theporch.com
Precedence: bulk
From: glowbugs@theporch.com
To: Multiple recipients of list <glowbugs@theporch.com>
Subject: GLOWBUGS digest 241
X-Listprocessor-Version: 6.0c -- ListProcessor by Anastasios Kotsikonas
X-Comment: Please send list server requests to listproc@theporch.com
Status: 0

GLOWBUGS Digest 241

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) Could there be a 1-tube superhet? (reflex amp)
by kellymed@tmxbris.mhs.oz.au (Murray Kelly)

Date: Sat, 20 Jul 96 10:35:07 AES
From: kellymed@tmxbris.mhs.oz.au (Murray Kelly)
To: glowbugs@theporch.com
Subject: Could there be a 1-tube superhet? (reflex amp)
Message-ID: <116@tmxbris.mhs.oz.au>

I can't find the paperwork but approx 20 years ago when I was studying
for my novice, one of the projects was just such a receiver done with
a single transistor. No reason why it wouldn't go with a tube.

Some detected audio was redirected thru the cathode (emitter). RF bypassing
was small caps. and Audio was all RF blocked with chokes, as I recall.

It all made sense, but I never tried it.

It's not lost, just misplaced!

* Murray Kelly vk4aok mkelly@tmxbris.mhs.oz.au *
* 29 Molonga Ter. / Graceville/ QLD. 4075/ Australia *
* ph/fax Intl+ 61 7 3379 3307 mobile 018 071 355 *

End of GLOWBUGS Digest 241
